

*Appln no. 10/668,753  
Amendment dated October 14, 2005  
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2005*

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 14, 18, 20, 22-24 and 29 are amended herein, and claims 4 and 25 are canceled. New claims 35-38 are added. No additional claim fees are needed.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-24, 26-29 and 31-38 are pending. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

### **112 Rejections**

Claims 23-29 and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Although Applicants disagree with this rejection, claims 23-25 have been amended to clarify the method. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

### **103 Rejections**

The claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Hoopman et al ('248) in view of Abrahamson and also over Hoopman et al ('217) in view of Abrahamson. Although Applicants disagree with these rejections, the claims have been amended to better define the abrasive articles and the methods; the claims, in generally, have been directed to abrasive articles having ceramic abrasive grains having an average particle size of about 100-400 micrometers. Dependent claims recite an average particle size of about 300 micrometers.

The two Hoopman references and Abrahamson have been discussed in prior papers. The Hoopman references provide abrasive articles that provide both high cut rate and fine finish.

The current application, however, goes farther than the Hoopman '248 and '217 patents, in that Applicants have obtained an abrasive article that does not experience the usual decrease in cut rate performance over time, as is seen in the Hoopman patents, and thus resulting in a greater total cut. It is the combination of the various features that provides improved cut performance over time. In this paper, the claims have been amended to more precisely direct the claims to the results discussed in the Declaration by James McArdle.

The results in the Declaration, and the discussion by Mr. McArdle in the Declaration, show that the combination of the three specific features, the ceramic abrasive particles with a size of about 100-400 micrometers in composites having a height of greater than 500 micrometers, provide abrasive cutting results which were unexpected. Applicants contend that it

*Appl'n no. 10/668,753  
Amendment dated October 14, 2005  
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2005*

would not have been obvious that the specific combination would be able to provide such improved grinding results over other abrasive articles that do not have those features.

Applicant s contend that the claims, as amended, are patentable, and request withdrawal of the rejections.

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Dan Biesterveld, Reg. No. 45,898, at 651.737.3193.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Oct 14, 2005

Mara E. DeBoe

Mara E. DeBoe  
Reg. No. 40,066

(612) 371-5222